

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RICHARD LARSON, JR.,

Case No. 19-CV-3028 (NEB/LIB)

Plaintiff,

WCCO; NFL; 93X/KXXR,

ORDER ON REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

Defendants.

The Court has received the January 2, 2020 Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Leo I. Brisbois. [ECF No. 3 (“R&R”).] The R&R recommends summarily dismissing complaint [ECF No. 1] for failure to state a claim on which relief can be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and denying the plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [ECF No. 2] as moot. (R&R at 2.) After the R&R was issued, the plaintiff, Richard Larson, Jr., filed a letter with the Court contending he properly brought various civil rights claims against various persons and entities. None of the actors listed in the letter are named as parties in this action. Further, none of the allegations in the letter correspond with any facts outlined in Larson’s original complaint.

After reviewing the letter, the Court concludes that it does not state any specific objections to the R&R. “Without objections, a district court is under no obligation to review the factual or legal conclusions of such a report, absent requirements from the Circuit in which it sits.” *Reed v. Curry Concrete Constr., Inc.*, No. 10-CV-4329 (JRT/LIB),

2011 WL 2015217, at *2 (D. Minn. May 23, 2011). When a party does not cite any reason why the R&R is incorrect, nor any basis for the Court to reach a different outcome, the Court is not required to conduct a *de novo* review of the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. See *Hudson v. Gammon*, 46 F.3d 785, 786 (8th Cir. 1995) (requiring *de novo* review only for the portions of the R&R to which objections are made). Larson's filing does not cite any specific objections to the R&R, so the court reviews the R&R for clear error. *Reed*, 2011 WL 2015217, at *2 (collecting cases); see also *Grinder v. Gammon*, 73 F.3d 793, 795 (8th Cir. 1996) (per curiam) (acknowledging that district courts review R&Rs for clear error absent an objection). The Court finds Judge Brisbois's reasoning sound and finds no legal basis to depart from his recommendations.

Finding no clear error, and based upon all the files, records, and proceedings in the above-captioned matter, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 3] is ACCEPTED;
2. This action is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE;
3. Richard Larson, Jr.'s application to proceed in forma pauperis [ECF No. 2] is

DENIED AS MOOT.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY

Dated: February 10, 2020

BY THE COURT:

s/Nancy E. Brasel

Nancy E. Brasel

United States District Judge